UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/648,664	10/10/2012	Yiftach Nun	2012P00042US	8075

52025   7590   12/13/2016
SAP SE c/o BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC
50 LOCUST AVENUE
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER
WEINRICH, BRIAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/13/2016	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

martin@BMTPATENT.COM
szpara@bmtpatent.com
colabella@bmtpatent.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

_____

Ex parte YIFTACH NUN and INBAL ZILBERMAN KUBOVSKY

_____

Appeal 2015-008132
Application 13/648,664[1]
Technology Center 2100

_____

Before MARC S. HOFF, ERIC S. FRAHM, and MATTHEW J. McNEILL,
Administrative Patent Judges.

McNEILL, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's
rejection of claims 1–5, 8–13, 15–19, and 21 which are all the claims
pending in this application.[2] We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

_____

[1] According to Appellants, the real party in interest is SAP AG. App. Br. 2.
[2] Claims 6, 7, 14, and 20 have been canceled.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Introduction

Appellants' application relates to receiving a request for a
Representational State Transfer (REST) or Open Data Protocol (OData)
object at an input field and suggesting a file associated with the REST or
OData object. Abstract. Claim 1 is illustrative of the appealed subject
matter and reads as follows:

> 1. A method comprising:
>
> receiving a URI associated with a RESTful application at
> an input field; and
>
> suggesting, via a processor, a plurality of previously
> opened REST or OData objects associated with the RESTful
> application;
>
> receiving a selection of one of the plurality of previously
> opened REST or OData objects associated with the RESTful
> application; and
>
> displaying, by using ODATA navigation over the selected
> REST or OData object, sub-objects of the one of the plurality of
> previously opened REST or OData objects in response to the
> selection.

The Examiner's Rejection[3]

Claims 1–5, 8–13, 15–19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§ 103(a) as unpatentable over Baldwin (US 2010/0094884 A1; Apr. 15,
2010), Smit (US 2006/0075120 A1; Apr. 6, 2006), and Ji (US 2013/0019314
A1; Jan. 17, 2013). Ans. 2–4.

---

[3] In the Non-Final Action, claims 1–5, 8–13, 15–19, and 21 were rejected
under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) as failing to comply with the written description
requirement. Non-Final Act. 4. However, the Examiner withdrew this
rejection in the Answer. Ans. 2.

ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner's rejections in light of Appellants' contentions that the Examiner has erred. We disagree with Appellants' contentions. Except as noted below, we adopt as our own: (1) the findings and reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and (2) the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer in response to Appellants' Appeal Brief. We concur with the conclusions reached by the Examiner. We highlight the following additional points.

Appellants argue the Examiner erred because Baldwin, Smit, and Ji do not teach or suggest using ODATA navigation over a selected REST or OData object to display sub-objects of the selected REST or OData object. App. Br. 6. Appellants also argue the Examiner erred in relying on Official Notice that IBM WebSphere is a client implementation for OData. App. Br. 7. In particular, Appellants argue WebSphere is a trademark, not a product. *Id.* Appellants argue WebSphere Application Server is a software product that performs the role of a web application server, but does not suggest the use of OData. *Id.*

Appellants have not persuaded us of Examiner error. The Examiner finds, and we agree, Baldwin teaches displaying a REST response object using a REST service. Ans. 2–3 (citing Baldwin ¶ 18). The Examiner further finds, and we agree, Smit teaches an IBM WebSphere that receives and interprets REST objects. Ans. 3. We also agree with the Examiner that Ji teaches using IBM WebSphere. Ans. 4 (citing Ji ¶¶ 66, 74, 87, 94, 97, 163). The Examiner takes Official Notice that IBM WebSphere includes

WebSphere Application Server, a software product that uses OData. Ans. 4. We are not persuaded by Appellants' argument that WebSphere is merely a trademark, not a software product, because WebSphere is a trademark used by IBM to designate software products. Ans. 4.

Appellants also argue the use of WebSphere Application Server does not suggest the use of OData, but Appellants present no evidence to support this argument. *See* App. Br. 7. The Examiner took Official Notice that WebSphere, including WebSphere Application Server, allows the use of OData, and cited evidence to support this fact, which Appellants have not persuasively rebutted. *See* Ans. 4-5.

Accordingly, we are not persuaded the Examiner erred in finding the combination of Baldwin, Smit, and Ji teaches or suggests "displaying, by using ODATA Navigation over the selected REST or OData object, sub-objects of the one of the plurality of previously opened REST or OData objects in response to the selection." We, therefore, sustain the rejection of claim 1. Appellants argue the patentability of claims 9 and 15 for the same reasons as claim 1. App. Br. 8. We, therefore, sustain the rejection of claims 9 and 15 for the same reasons. We also sustain the rejection of dependent claims 2–5, 8, 10–13, 16–19, and 21, which were not argued separately from their respective independent claims. *Id.*

DECISION

We affirm the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 1–5, 8–13, 15–19, and 21.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED